To: CN=Brian Schumacher/OU=LV/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Christopher Impellitteri/OU=CI/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Davidw Charters/OU=ERT/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Diane Gregg/OU=R6/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Kelly Smith/OU=ADA/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Mark Burkhardt/OU=R8/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Christopher Impellitteri/OU=CI/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Davidw Charters/OU=ERT/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Diane Gregg/OU=R6/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Kelly Smith/OU=ADA/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Mark Burkhardt/OU=R8/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Davidw Charters/OU=ERT/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Diane Gregg/OU=R6/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Kelly Smith/OU=ADA/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Mark Burkhardt/OU=R8/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Diane Gregg/OU=R6/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Kelly Smith/OU=ADA/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Mark Burkhardt/OU=R8/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Kelly Smith/OU=ADA/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Mark Burkhardt/OU=R8/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Mark Burkhardt/OU=R8/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]
Cc: []
From: CN=Brian Schumacher/OU=LV/O=USEPA/C=US
Sent: Tue 12/11/2012 5:04:45 PM
Subject: Revised table of analytical methods and a few next steps.
Analytical Methods Comparisons v2.xlsx

Folks,

First, thank you for your inputs. I have updated the table with all the feedback and left it in a format that Diane politely converted it to so it can be printed on a legal size sheet of paper. It is attached at the end of this email.

For the next steps, here are the original charges to the work group:

The charge to technical workgroups is to:
Identify background materials that help address the questions
Perform a preliminary analysis of where we have similar approaches across EPA (ORD, Program Offices, Regions). Where do approaches differ and why?
Create recommendations for developing consistent approaches
Identify a leader to facilitate their workgroup

I think we have covered the first and second bullets for the most part. I'll take the lead and cover the workgroup in bullet 4 unless someone has a burning desire to be the lead. If so, it's your.

One of the two areas here that we need to discussed is: (1) why the approaches differ used at the labs differ but that leads to the question of "how much" do they differ. For example, if I use SW-846 Method 6010 and you use CWA Method 200.7 for metals, they are both ICP-OES methods that get processed in basically the same way, so are they different other than QA needs? There are other circumstances where prep or analytical methods differ or preservatives were different (e.g., VOCs) and some of that is based on "I use the instrumentation I have "in-house" or other knowledge gained through experience that is not specified in the standard methods (e.g., preserving the VOCs with TSP where SW-846 Methods 5021 says unpreserved or with acid which would help purge the sample before it ever reaches the lab). So here, please think about the question and let me know any thoughts you might have.

The other area is the third bullet - do we need, or do we already have, consistent approaches/methods and how do we decide which method is the "base" method where we differ. Let me know your thought here as well.

Other implementation questions that came in a different email were: (a) what suite of analytes should be collected, (b) what are the holding times (we have that in our table already so done here), (c)

what analytical methods will be used (that's what the whole table is about and what I've highlighted above to discuss), and (d) is there a standard approach for reporting data? If you would be so kind as to let me know your thoughts on (a) and (d), I would be grateful.

I've highlighted in red the questions I need input on. Hope it helps a bit. Could I please have your answers to me by this Friday noon? Thank you.

Brian